

Table 7
Proposed Amendment Mobile Source Noise

Sensitive Receptor	Distance Between Rd. and Sensitive Receptor ^a (ft.)	Existing		Existing + Amendment	
		Traffic Volumes	dBA L _{eq} ^b	Traffic Volumes	dBA L _{eq} ^b
Residences on Northwestern Ave. in the 2,100 ft. e. of amendment area where Northwestern is oriented north-south	10	5	38.3	11	41.5
Residences on Belleview Ave. (near EB HWY 101)	60	557	69.0	850	70.8
Residences on Eeola Ave. (near WB HWY 101)	60	468	68.1	755	70.2
Residences on Wildwood Ave. (between Butcher St. and Townsend St.)	20	438	64.8	672	66.6
^a The distances identified are between the residences and the roads that would carry amendment traffic (e.g., Northwestern Ave., HWY 101 and Wildwood Ave.).					
^b Results from FHWA Traffic Noise Model (Version 2.5 Look-Up Tables).					
Source: Planwest Partners, 2010.					

As indicated in 7: (1) peak hour traffic noise currently exceeds the State's noise compatibility standard of 60 dBA L_{eq} for single-family residences at the closest existing residences along three of the four roadway links analyzed; and (2) peak-hour traffic associated with the proposed amendment would exacerbate these exceedances. However, in each case the proposed amendment would result in an inaudible (>3 dBA) increase in noise. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not result in a substantial permanent increase in mobile source noise, and the impact would be *less than significant*.

In addition to the generation of mobile source noise as evaluated above, the proposed amendment would expose new industrial/commercial development and its occupants to traffic noise from HWY 101. HWY 101 lies approximately 120 feet south of the southern boundary of the amendment area. Based on FHWA modeling of existing plus amendment p.m. peak hour traffic volumes on HWY 101, traffic noise from the highway would be 69.0 dBA L_{eq} at the amendment area's southern property boundary. Because this is below the State's 70 and 75 dBA L_{eq} noise compatibility standard for commercial and industrial uses, respectively, the proposed amendment would not expose persons associated with the proposed amendment to mobile source noise levels in excess of applicable noise standards, and the impact would be *less than significant*.

Stationary Source (Non-Traffic) Noise: Stationary noise sources associated with new industrial/commercial development permitted under the proposed amendment would generate noise during operation. Table 8 below identifies the noise levels generated by stationary noise sources most often associated with industrial/commercial development at 50 feet and 1,600 feet from the noise source (the latter being the distance between the amendment area and the closest existing noise-sensitive uses - the Belleview Avenue residences located approximately 1,600 feet to the south). As indicated, amendment-related stationary source noise would be a maximum of 55 dBA L_{eq} at the Belleview residences which is below the City's 60 dBA L_{eq} exterior noise standard for residential uses. Therefore, the impact would be *less than significant*.

<p align="center">Table 8 Noise Levels from Typical Stationary Equipment</p>		
Equipment	Maximum Level L_{eq} dBA	
	@ 50 Ft.	@ 1,600 Ft. ^d
Industrial-grade Air Conditioners, Heaters and Ventilation Systems (HVAC)	75 ^a	45
Loading Docks	75 ^a	45
Parking Lots	63 ^b	33
Compressors, forklifts, and back-up generators	85 ^c	55
Boilers	70 ^c	40
^a COE, 2008. ^b City of Glendora, 2004. ^c COE, 2010. The 85 dBA L_{eq} identified above @50 feet from compressors, forklifts and back-up generators is a worst-case condition since this equipment is usually operated within structures which can attenuate noise by up to 15 dBA. ^d Based on industry standard of 6 dBA noise level reduction for each doubling of distance. ^e Source: Planwest Partners, 2010.		

b): Amendment-related construction activities for permitted uses (jack hammering, grading and trenching, etc.) could generate groundborne noise/vibration during the construction period, while amendment-related operation of permitted uses (especially any heavy industrial or manufacturing uses) could generate groundborne noise/vibration during operation. However, any such noise/vibration would not be excessive because the nearest existing sensitive receptors are the Belleview Avenue residences located approximately 1,600 feet to the south and the Stone residences located approximately 1,800 feet to the east, both of which are too far away to experience noise/vibration from the amendment area. **No impact** would occur.

d): In addition to the relevant noise policies from the City of Rio Dell Noise Element listed under "Mobile Source (Traffic) Noise" above, the Element identifies the permissible hourly noise exposure standards identified in Table 9 below.

<p align="center">Table 9 Rio Dell's Hourly Noise Exposure Standards</p>	
Duration	Exterior Noise Level (dBA L_{eq})
1 hour	105
8 hours	90
Source: City of Rio Dell, 2001.	

Construction activities associated with new development permitted under the proposed amendment would generate temporary construction noise during the construction period. Table 10 below identifies the noise levels generated by standard construction equipment at 50 feet and 1,600 feet from the noise source (the latter being the distance between the amendment area and the Belleview Avenue residences). As indicated, amendment-related construction noise would be a maximum of 58 dBA L_{eq} at the residences which is well below the City's 1 hour (105 dBA L_{eq}) and 8 hour (90 dBA L_{eq}) permissible hourly outdoor noise exposure standards. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels, and the impact would be **less than significant**.

Table 10 Noise Levels from Typical Construction Equipment		
Equipment	Maximum Level L_{eq} dBA	
	@ 50 Ft. ^a	@ 1,600 Ft. ^b
Truck	85	55
Backhoe, Air compressor	78	48
Concrete mixer	79	49
Scraper	84	54
Jack hammer	89	58
Dozer	82	52
Paver	77	47
Generator	81	51
^a FHWA, 2006.		
^b Based on industry standard of 6 dBA noise level reduction for each doubling of distance.		
Source: Planwest Partners, 2010.		

e-f): The amendment area is not located within a public airport land use plan area, within two miles of a public airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The closest airport is Rohnerville Airport located approximately 5 miles to the north. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not expose people residing or working in the amendment area to excessive airport or aircraft-related noise levels. **No impact** would occur.

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in the area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

a): The proposed amendment represents amendments to regulations, plans, and other general criteria governing the conduct of a continuing program (the General Plan) rather than subdivision maps, development plans, or other development entitlements. No new housing units would be developed that could house an additional resident population, and no new industrial, commercial, or other development would occur that could generate an employee population, as a direct result of the proposed amendment. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not directly induce substantial population growth. **A less than significant impact.**

The proposed amendment does not include specific proposals for new housing or to extend roadways, utilities or other infrastructure to areas not already served, and does not include

proposals to increase the capacities of the City's water treatment plant, wastewater treatment plant, or other utilities. Therefore, the proposed would not increase the capacity of the City to serve additional population, and thus would not indirectly induce substantial population growth. A *less than significant impact* would occur.

b-c): The amendment area does not include existing housing or employment-generating uses. Therefore, development permitted under the proposed amendment would not have the potential to displace substantial numbers of existing housing, residents or employees, and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. *No impact* would occur.

14. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?		X		
b) Police protection?			X	
c) Schools?			X	
d) Parks?			X	

a): Fire protection service in the amendment area is provided by the Fortuna Fire Protection District (FFPD) out of its headquarters station in Fortuna. The FFPD has 65 firefighters divided among its five fire companies and three fire stations, along with five engines, two aerials, one rescue vehicle and one tender (HLAFCo, 2008a). The proposed amendment would permit the development of up to 284,360 square feet of new industrial/commercial uses with an estimated 403 employees.⁴ Assuming that one-third of these employees would be new residents within the FFPD service area, and based on an FFPD firefighter to population ratio of 5:1,000 (Ibid.), development permitted under the proposed amendment would generate a demand for 0.7 new FFPD firefighters. Because it is anticipated that these additional firefighters would be able to be accommodated at FFPD's existing headquarters station without the need to expand the station, the amendment would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection service. Still, the proposed amendment would facilitate a need to improve existing streets to, and develop new streets within, the amendment area. The improvement/development of these streets without adequate review and approval by the FFPD could result in inadequate fire vehicle access. This impact would be *less than significant with mitigation incorporated*.

⁴ Based on employee generation rates of one employee per 500 feet of commercial development and one employee per 1,000 feet of industrial development (COE, 1996).

Mitigation Measures:

SERV-1: The City of Rio Dell shall refer development proposals within the amendment area to FFPD for review and comment on fire access, water supply and other emergency response factors.

b): Police protection service in the amendment area is provided by the City of Rio Dell Police Department (RDPD) out of its station at 675 Wildwood Avenue in Rio Dell. RDPD has eight officers and five police cruisers to serve its existing 3,299 residents (DOF 2008, HLAFCo, 2008b). Assuming that one-third of the 403 new employees projected associated with the proposed amendment were to be new residents within the RDPD service area, and based on an RDPD officer to population ratio of 1.8:1,000 (Planwest, 2008a), the proposed amendment would allow development that would generate a demand for 0.2 new RDPD officers. Because it is anticipated that these additional officers would be able to be accommodated at RDPD's existing station, the amendment would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police protection service. Also, while monitoring would be needed to ensure that the additional officers were available when needed, such monitoring is already required by mitigation in the 2008 Sawmill Annexation IS/MND. With this monitoring, the impact would be *less than significant*.

c): Elementary and middle school service in the amendment area is the responsibility of the Fortuna Union Elementary School District (FUESD) and Fortuna Union High School District (FUHSD; Winzler & Kelly, 2007, Varner, 2008). The proposed amendment would permit industrial/commercial rather than residential development and thus would not generate a direct demand for school facilities or services. Also, while the industrial/commercial uses permitted under the amendment would generate some indirect demand for school facilities and services through the possible attraction of new residents to the City, this development would be subject to payment of State-mandated school impact fees for such development, with payment of these fees considered by the State to represent full mitigation for impacts to schools. Therefore, the impact would be *less than significant*.

d): Park service in the City of Rio Dell and the amendment area is the responsibility of the City of Rio Dell. There are several existing park and recreational facilities available to City residents, including playing fields, playgrounds and tennis courts (16.1 acres) located at Eagle Prairie Elementary and Monument Middle School, a playground and ball park (3.4 acres) adjacent to the RDPD fire hall, two small triangle parks, and two City-maintained access points to the river (Ibid.). The proposed amendment would permit industrial/commercial rather than residential development, and thus would not result in a direct demand for parks. Also, while the industrial/commercial uses permitted under the amendment would generate some indirect demand for parks through the possible attraction of new residents to the City, mitigation is identified in the 2008 Sawmill Annexation IS/MND requiring the City to adopt a park dedication/fee ordinance and have new development in the amendment area pay the adopted fees. Therefore, the impact would be *less than significant*.

15. RECREATION	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	

a-b): See Response 14.d.

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation systems, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit.		X		
b) Conflict with an applicable CMP, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		X		
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?		X		
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?		X		

a-b): Existing Conditions: Regional access to the City of Rio Dell and the amendment area is provided by U.S. Highway 101 (HWY 101). HWY 101 is a grade-separated four-lane highway bisecting the City, with local exits at Moore Fuels and Metropolitan Road and local interchanges at Wildwood Avenue, Davis Street and Main Street (Figure 2). Wildwood Avenue is the main Arterial and business route for the City, running through the Town Center. Davis Street and Scotia Boulevard are Minor Arterials and link Wildwood Avenue to HWY 101. Rio Dell proper

and the Sawmill Annexation Area, including the amendment area, are separated by the Eel River - HWY 101 connects the two via a bridge over the river.

The amendment area is provided access via Northwestern Avenue, a two-lane, 40 foot-wide Collector running from north of Moore Fuels in the northwest to south of the Stone area (the area where Northwestern turns northward) in the southeast, with accesses to HWY 101 at Moore Fuels and Metropolitan Road. Access from Northwestern to the amendment area, which is currently blocked by wooden barriers, is provided via a driveway which feeds to an existing on-site north-south oriented road (Figure 3). No bikeways currently exist or are designated by the City's General Plan along Northwestern Avenue.

The City of Rio Dell does not have adopted level of service (LOS) standard or other significance criteria for local roadways, while Caltrans requires LOS C or better on state and interstate facilities in rural areas. LOS C or better is generally considered acceptable in rural areas. The six intersections in the vicinity of the amendment area expected to accommodate most traffic associated with the proposed amendment are evaluated in this analysis to determine whether the amendment could cause traffic congestion at these intersection. The six study intersections are listed below and their locations are identified in (Figure 12):

1. Amendment Area Access and Northwestern Ave.
2. Metropolitan Rd. and Northwestern Ave.
3. Metropolitan Rd. and HWY 101
4. HWY 101 Access (at Moore Fuels) and HWY 101
5. Wildwood Ave. and Belleview Ave.
6. Wildwood Ave. and HWY 101 NB Ramps

Existing p.m. peak hour (5:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.) traffic volumes at each of the study intersections are identified in Table 11 based on traffic counts conducted by Planwest on Thursday, November 17, 2010. Based on field observation taken at the time, none of these intersections currently experience undue delay or unacceptable level of service during the p.m. peak hour (e.g., all intersections currently experience relatively free-flow traffic conditions).

Intersection		P.M. Peak Hour Traffic Volumes			
		North Bound	South Bound	East Bound	West Bound
1	Amendment Area Access Rd. / Northwestern Ave.		0	0	6
2	Metropolitan Rd. / Northwestern Ave.		4	0	6
3	Metropolitan Rd. / HWY 101	5	6	557	468
4	HWY 101 Access Rd. (Moore Fuel) / HWY 101		3	587	496
5	Wildwood Ave. / Belleview Ave.	167	271	94	
6	Wildwood Ave. / HWY 101 NB Ramps	219	66		11

Source: Planwest Partners, November, 2010.

**Figure 12 :
Traffic Assessment Intersections**



Impact Analysis: Table 12 identifies trip generation estimates for the 284,360 square feet of new industrial/commercial development that would be permitted under the proposed amendment. As indicated, this development would generate an estimated 586 trips during the p.m. peak hour. Table 13 identifies the trip distribution assumptions applied to projected amendment-related traffic in this analysis.

Table 12 Proposed Amendment Trip Generation									
Land Use	sq. ft. ^a	Daily		P.M. Peak Hour					
		Rate/1,000 sq. ft. ^b	Trips	Rate/1,000 sq. ft. ^b	Trips	Rate In ^b	Rate Out ^b	In	Out
Industrial	165,876	6.96	1,154	0.86	143	0.21	0.79	30	113
Commercial	118,484	28.50	3,377	3.75	443	0.38	0.62	168	275
Total	284,360	--	4,531	--	586	--	--	198	388

^a Industrial/Commercial = 80% commercial and 20% industrial.
^b Trip generate rates and proportion of trips in/out from the ITE, Trip Generation, 7th Edition, Volumes 2-3. The daily and p.m. peak hour trip generation rates shown for commercial are averages of the ITE rates for the three most common categories of commercial uses (e.g., retail, office, and shopping center).
Source: Planwest Partners 2008.

Table 13 Proposed Amendment Trip Distribution Assumptions	
Roadway	Percent
Amendment Area Access Rd. (NB and SB)	100
Northwestern Ave. (EB)	1
Northwestern Ave. (WB)	99
Metropolitan Rd. @ HWY 101 (NB and SB)	94
HWY 101 Access Rd. (Moore Fuel) @ HWY 101 (NB and SB)	5
HWY 101 EB	50
HWY 101 WB	49
Wildwood Ave. (NB and SB)	30

Source: Planwest Partners, November, 2010.

Table 14 identifies p.m. peak hour traffic volume at each of the study intersections under existing plus amendment conditions based on the trip generation estimates and trip distribution assumptions identified in Tables 12 and 13, respectively. Table 14 also identifies the amendment-related percentage increase in traffic at each of the intersections. As indicated, the proposed amendment would increase traffic volumes at each of the study intersections by at least 175 additional trips, except for Intersection 4 where amendment traffic volumes would be minimal (6 additional trips).

Intersections 1 through 3 would experience the most amendment-related p.m. peak hour traffic volumes. In addition, these intersections currently have relatively narrow traffic lanes and lack stop controls and/or dedicated turn lanes (or in the case of HWY 101, have 65 mph speeds combined with cross traffic). Therefore, amendment-related traffic could potentially result in inadequate LOS, inadequate queuing distances and/or traffic safety issues (e.g., inadequate line of sight, cross traffic, etc.) at these intersections. This impact would be ***less than significant with mitigation incorporated***.

Table 14 Existing, Existing + Proposed Amendment, and % Increase in Traffic Volumes					
Intersection		Existing, Existing + Amendment, and % Increase in P.M. Peak Hour Traffic Volumes			
		North Bound	South Bound	East Bound	West Bound
1	Amendment Area Access Rd. / Northwestern Ave. % increase	0\198 100%	0\388 100%	0\6 100%	6\586 98%
2	Metropolitan Rd. / Northwestern Ave. % increase	X	4\555 99%	0\29 100%	6\35 83%
3	Metropolitan Rd. / HWY 101 % increase	5\556 99%	6\557 99%	557\850 34%	468\755 38%
4	HWY 101 Access Rd. (Moore Fuel) / HWY 101 % increase	X	3\9 67%	587\593 1%	496\502 1%
5	Wildwood Ave. / Belleview Ave. % increase	167\343 51%	271\447 39%	94\123 24%	X
6	Wildwood Ave. / HWY 101 NB Ramps % increase	219\395 45%	66\241 73%	X	11\40 73%

Source: Planwest Partners, November, 2010.

Intersection 4 would experience minimal amendment-related p.m. peak hour traffic volumes, and thus would result in minimal traffic congestion and no expected queuing or traffic safety issues. Therefore, the impact at this intersection would be *less than significant*.

Intersections 5 and 6 would be located a greater distance from the amendment area than Intersections 1 through 3, and would experience less amendment-related p.m. peak hour traffic volumes than these intersections. In addition, Intersections 5 and 6 have been developed to urban standards, with relatively wide travel lanes, dedicated turning lanes and stop controls, where required, and adequate site distance. Therefore, amendment-related p.m. peak hour traffic would not be expected to result in unacceptable LOS, inadequate queuing distances, or traffic safety issues at these intersections. Still, because the proposed amendment would increase traffic congestion at Intersections 5 and 6, and in order to provide a conservative analysis, a significant impact is identified. This impact would be *less than significant with mitigation incorporated*.

Mitigation Measures:

TRANS-1: The City of Rio Dell shall require that a traffic study be completed for development projects exceeding two acres or 10,000 square feet of building area in the amendment area. The study shall: (1) show all proposed on-site roadway improvements; (2) evaluate traffic level of service impacts, queuing distance adequacy and traffic safety impacts on the proposed on-site roadway system and at Intersections 1-3 and 5-6; and (3) identify any off-site intersection and roadway improvements required to avoid any unacceptable LOS, inadequate queuing distances, and/or traffic safety issues on-site and at Intersections 1-3 and 5-6. The traffic study shall be submitted to the City of Rio Dell and Caltrans for review and approval.

c): Rohnerville Airport, located south of Fortuna, is the closest airport to Rio Dell. It is a general aviation facility operated by Humboldt County. Most commercial aviation traffic in the county is based well to the north at Arcata/Eureka Airport. The amendment area is not located

within the Airport Land Use Compatibility Zones for Rohnerville Airport or any other airport as designated in the Humboldt County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, and would have no effect on aviation traffic. Also, while the proposed amendment would permit the development of up to 284,360 square feet of new industrial/commercial uses which would create an estimated 403 new jobs, it is anticipated that most if not all of these jobs would be filled by current residents in Humboldt County such that the amendment would not substantially increase air traffic levels. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not result in a change in existing air traffic patterns, and *no impact* would occur.

d): The proposed amendment does not include proposals for new off-site streets or intersections, and therefore would not have the potential to substantially increase hazards due to off-site design features. Also, while development of the industrial/commercial uses permitted under the proposed amendment would require the development of a new on-site roadway system, this system would be required to be designed and constructed in accordance with all City of Rio Dell design standards which have been formulated to avoid substantial hazards due to design features. Therefore, *no impact* would occur.

The proposed amendment would not permit the development of agricultural uses in the amendment area. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not have the potential to mix slow moving farm equipment with faster moving vehicles, and thus would not substantially increase hazards due to incompatible uses. *No impact* would occur.

e): See Responses 8.h and 14.a.

Mitigation Measures:

TRANS-2: Implement Mitigation Measure SERV-1.

f): The City of Rio Dell does not have adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation other than the Safe Routes to Schools Program (Planwest, 2008). Also, while Redwood Transit System currently offers service to the City, it does not offer service to portions of the City north of the Eel River, including the amendment site. Still, there are regional plans supporting alternative transportation, such as HCOG's Humboldt County Regional Trails Master Plan (Rio Dell is an HCOG member). With respect to Rio Dell, the plan specifically states that "When new development projects are proposed within the city, informal trails should be identified for dedication by the city" (HCOG, 2010). Mitigation in the 2008 Sawmill Annexation IS/MND requires industrial and commercial projects in Sawmill Annexation Area that exceed two acres or 10,000 square feet of building area prepare and implement a bicycle and pedestrian facility plan. With implementation of this mitigation, the amendment would be consistent with the Regional Trails Master Plan, and the impact would be *less than significant*.

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b) Require construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
c) Require new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

a): The proposed amendment would permit new industrial/commercial uses that would generate wastewater requiring treatment by the City of Rio Dell's WWTP. It is anticipated that this wastewater would be standard urban wastewater, especially given federal and state controls on permitted concentrations of heavy metals or other problematic pollutant constituents in municipal wastewater. In addition, the City's WWTP operates under Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs), NPDES permits, Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) requirements, and other applicable permits and regulations which avoid significant water quality impacts associated with the discharge of treated wastewater to the Eel River. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB, and **no impact** would occur.

b-e): The City of Rio Dell General Plan Land Use Element contains a policy requiring that all new development in the Sawmill Annexation Area, including within the amendment area, connect to the City's municipal water, sewer and storm drain systems. Currently, City water lines extend to the Eel River Sawmill portion of the amendment area. In order for development to occur in the amendment area, City wastewater and storm drain lines would need to be extended across the Eel River to this area. However, a platform for utility lines to span the river already exists (e.g., HWY 101 bridge), and developed rights-of-way (streets) with space for utility lines already exists to the amendment area, such that it is not anticipated the extension of utilities would result in significant environmental effects. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

The proposed amendment would permit new urban development that would increase the demand on the City's water, wastewater and storm drain systems. This increase in demand is evaluated.

Water: Domestic and fire flow water in the amendment area is provided by the City of Rio Dell's municipal water system which has a water right of 1.701 MGD (City of Rio Dell 2003), a winter capacity of 1.008 MGD and a summer capacity of 0.792 MGD (HLAFCo 2008b). Water from the infiltration gallery in the Eel River which provides the City with water is pumped to the City's water treatment facility (WTF) which has a capacity of 0.792 MGD, is then pumped to one of four water storage tanks ranging in size from 100,000 to 500,000 gallons for a total combined storage capacity of 1.1 million gallons, and is then gravity-fed to the City's distribution system which contains 11 miles of pipe, 5 miles of which was recently replaced under the City's Infrastructure Rehabilitation Project (City of Rio Dell 2003, HLAFCo 2008b).

The City has an existing peak water demand of 0.474 MGD (HLAFCo, 2008b) and a per capita peak water use rate of 144 gpd per person (Planwest, 2008b). Applying this rate to the estimated 403 new employees associated with new development permitted under the proposed amendment yields a peak water demand estimate of 58,000 gpd (0.058 MGD). Adding this to existing peak water demand yields an existing plus amendment peak water demand estimate of 0.532 MGD. Thus, adequate capacity exists in the City's water right, existing infiltration gallery and existing water storage tanks to serve new development permitted under the proposed amendment. However, it is unclear whether the existing tanks are in the right locations to serve the amendment area, or whether the existing water trunk lines and pumps that would serve permitted development have sufficient capacity to serve the development without improvement. Still, in addition to the City infrastructure planning mitigation already described, the 2008 Sawmill Annexation identifies mitigation requiring that: (1) development projects over 3 acres have a water analysis prepared demonstrating how adequate municipal water and fire flow will be provided without adversely impacting existing water service/capacity; (2) the City annually monitor the performance of the City's municipal water system, prepare plans for increasing capacity when system-wide capacity hits 90%, and provide larger pipelines and pumps when required; and (3) the City establish a fair-share fee program applicable to new development to help fund system-wide improvements. With implementation of this mitigation, the impact would be *less than significant*.

The amendment would allow development that would facilitate the need for new water connections. Typically, each new connection reduces existing water pressure in the City's distribution system. Currently, water pressure in the City's system meets fire flow requirements (HLAFCo, 2008b), and the City conducts annual monitoring of water pressure in the distribution system once project development starts and improves the system, as required to ensure the provision of adequate fire flow. Because the City monitors its water system and takes improves the system, as required, to provide adequate fire flow, and because development permitted under the proposed amendment would go through development review by the City where the plans for the provision of adequate fire flow would be required, the impact would be *less than significant*.

Wastewater: Wastewater collection, treatment and disposal service in the City is provided by the City's municipal wastewater system. Collection is provided by a gravity fed flow system with two lift stations (Hale 2008). Treatment is provided by the City's wastewater treatment facility (WWTF) which treats wastewater to primary and secondary standards and then either discharges it directly to the Eel River (October 1 - May 14) or stores it in a seasonal percolation pond (May 15 - September 30) for later discharge to the river. The WWTF has an existing average dry weather flow (ADWF) design capacity of 0.9 MGD and currently treats 0.41 MGD ADWF (HLAFCo 2008b, Winzler & Kelly 2008). As a result of RWQCB concerns over the City's seasonal percolation pond, where effluent has been documented surfacing on the Eel River gravel bars adjacent to the pond, the Board issued Cease and Desist Order (CDO) R1-2003-0046 in 2003. The Order placed a cap (140 EDUs) on the number of new wastewater connections the City could approve before remediating the problem, and outlined an effluent disposal compliance schedule for the remediation. To date, approximately 40 EDUs worth of excess connections remain under the cap (Ibid.). In response, planning is underway by the City to upgrade the WWTP to address RWQCB's concerns.

The City has an existing wastewater generation of 0.41 MGD ADWF (HLAFCo 2008b) and a per capita wastewater generation rate of 124 gpd per person (Planwest, 2008b). Applying this rate to the estimated 403 new employees associated with new development permitted under the proposed amendment yields a wastewater generation estimate of 49,970 gpd (0.05 MGD). Adding this to existing wastewater generation yields an existing plus amendment wastewater generation estimate of 0.46 MGD. Thus, adequate capacity exists at the City's WWTF to serve new development permitted under the amendment. However, the City has access to only approximately 40 EDUs worth of this capacity under the RWQCB CDO. Until either the existing CDO connections cap is lifted or the proposed WWTF upgrades are constructed, inadequate available new wastewater capacity may exist to serve all the new development permitted under the amendment. Furthermore, it is unclear whether the existing wastewater trunk lines and pumps that would serve this development have sufficient capacity to serve the development without improvement. However, with implementation of the mitigation measures from the 2008 Sawmill Annexation IS/MND described under "Water" above which also apply to wastewater infrastructure, the impact would be *less than significant*.

Storm Water Drainage: Storm water drainage service in the City of Rio Dell is provided by the City of Rio Dell municipal storm water drainage system which drains to the Eel River via underground drainage conduits, artificial and natural drainage ditches, drainage inlets and storm drain manholes. In the amendment area, drainage is from the hillsides in the north toward the river to the south. The system, including the discharges of storm water to the river, operates under a Phase II National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) storm water permit and is classified as a nonpoint pollution source (Humboldt County 2002).

The proposed amendment would the development of new urban uses within a portion of the Eel River Sawmill which is already dominated by impervious surfaces. Hence, the amendment would not substantially increase stormwater runoff. However, development

could substantially alter existing drainage patterns in the area, and based on mitigation in the 2008 Sawmill Annexation IS/MND which requires connection of new development to the City's municipal storm drain system, increase the demand for capacity in that storm drain system. Because specific development proposals have not been made at this time given the programmatic nature of the proposed entitlements, drainage volumes, rates and the direction of flow before and after development cannot currently be identified. However, given the lack of City municipal storm drainage infrastructure in the area, development permitted under the amendment could potentially: (1) result in flooding on- or off-site; (2) create the need to develop City municipal storm drainage infrastructure where no such infrastructure currently exists; and (3) increase the demand for, and consume existing available capacity within, the City's municipal storm drain system. Still, with implementation of the mitigation measures from the 2008 IS/MND described under "Water" above which also apply to storm water drainage infrastructure, and with implementation of the mitigation in that 2008 IS/MND described in Response 9.c-d, the impact would be *less than significant*.

f-g): The City of Rio Dell generated a total of 1,220 tons per year (tpy) of solid waste in 2004 (CIWMB 2008). Household waste accounted for 44% of this total (537 tons), while business waste accounted for 56% (683 tons) (Ibid.). This waste is collected and disposed of by the Eel River Disposal & Resource Recovery Inc. (ERD). In addition, the City has contracted with ERD to provide bi-weekly curbside recycling and green waste pick-up in an effort to reduce the City waste stream, and the City promotes composting to reduce its waste stream through the selling of compost bins residents and businesses at subsidized rates. Municipal and recycling waste are transported to ERD's transfer facility in Fortuna, where the municipal waste is transported to the Anderson Landfill in Shasta County and the recycling waste sorted and sold to a variety of users (Ibid.). Green waste is transported to the Scotia transfer station where it is used as fuel in PALCO's cogeneration plant to generate electricity (Ibid.).

The proposed amendment would permit new urban uses that would generate solid waste. Assuming CalRecycle's estimated average solid waste generation rates of 5.0 lb/1000 sq. ft./day for industrial and 9.2 lb/1000 sq. ft./day for commercial development, this development would generate an estimated 1,920 lb/day (350 tpy) of solid waste (CalRecycle, 2010). The Anderson Landfill has an existing permitted capacity of 16.0 million cubic yards and an existing remaining capacity of 8.0 million cubic yards (approximately 2.4 million tons; CIWMB, 2008). Therefore, development permitted under the amendment would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate its solid waste disposal needs, and the impact would be *less than significant impact*.

The Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939) requires cities to reduce their solid waste streams by incremental targets leading to a 70% reduction by 2015 (Planwest 2008b). The City of Rio Dell has been implementing the recycling, green waste and composting programs described above in an effort to comply with AB 939. According to the CIWMB, the City achieved a waste diversion rate of 54% in 2006 (CIWMB 2008). Unless development facilitated by the proposed amendment were to actively participate in these waste diversion programs, and unless features were incorporated into this development that would facilitate an even greater waste diversion rate than is currently occurring in the City (e.g., must eventually achieve 70%

diversion), development permitted under the proposed amendment could potentially compromise the City's ability to comply with AB 939. However, the 2008 Sawmill Annexation IS/MND identifies mitigation requiring that: new development participate in the City's recycling pick-up, green waste pick-up, and composting programs; provide dedicated solid waste, recycling and green waste bins and enclosures; and that construction waste associated with any demolition of existing structures or asphalt be recycled to the maximum extent feasible. With implementation of this mitigation, the impact would be *less than significant*.

18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish/wildlife, cause fish/wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate plant/animal community, reduce the number/range of a rare/endangered species, or eliminate important examples of major periods of CA history/prehistory?				X
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?				X
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial direct/indirect adverse effects on human beings?				X

a-c): Based on the proposed amendment and applicable regulations, there is **no** evidence to indicate the proposed would result in the following after implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the 2008 Sawmill Annexation IS/MND and this IS/MND:

- The potential to degrade the quality of the environment, reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or pre-history;
- The potential to achieve short-term to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals;
- Impacts that individually limited but cumulatively considerable; or
- Environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Based on the above, *no impact* would occur.

REFERENCES

Association of Environmental Professionals (AEP), 2007. Alternative Approaches to Analyzing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Global Climate Change in CEQA Documents.

California Department of Finance (DOF), 2008.

California Department of Fish & Game (DFG), 2003. California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), Fortuna, Hydesville, and Scotia quads. Review conducted by Winzler & Kelly. August.

--, 2007. California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) – Screening Level, Fortuna, Hydesville, and Scotia quads. Review conducted by Planwest Partners. October.

California Energy Commission (CEC), 2006. Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 to 2004. December.

California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR), 2003. General Plan Guidelines, Appendix C – Guidelines for the Preparation and Content of the Noise Element of the General Plan.

California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB), 2008. Jurisdictional - City of Rio Dell, <http://ciwmb.ca.gov/Profiles/Juris/JurProfile1.asp>.

California State Scenic Highway Mapping System, 2008. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/index.htm.

CalRecycle, 2010. Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates, <http://www.clarecycle.ca.gov/WasteChar/WasteGenRates>.

Dyett & Bhatia, 2002. Humboldt 2025 General Plan Update, Natural Resources and Hazards, Volume II: Detailed Watershed Characteristics and Regulatory Framework Analysis. September

Environmental Data Resources Inc. (EDR), 2007. The EDR Data Map Area Study for the Rio Dell Wastewater Reuse Project. August 17, 2007.

Eureka, City of (COE), 1996. City of Eureka General Plan.

--2008. DEIR for the Marina Center Mixed Use Development Project (SCH #2006042024). Prepared by ESA for the COE. November.

--, 2010. Draft IS/MND for the Lost Coast Brewery Project. Prepared by Planwest Partners for COE. November.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), 2008. FEMA comments on the 2007 Draft PEIR for the City of Fortuna General Plan 2030. May 22.

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), 2006. Roadway Construction Noise Model Users Guide. FHWA-HEP-05-054, DOT-VNTSC-FHWA-05-01. January

Glendora, City of, 2004. DEIR for the Diamond Ridge Specific Plan (SCH #2004111124). Prepared by Applied Planning, Inc. for the City of Glendora. November.

Hale, Jim, 2008. Director, City of Rio Dell Public Works, Pers. Comm., April 10.

Humboldt County, 1984. Humboldt County General Plan, Framework Plan Vol. I.

--, 2002. Humboldt County General Plan Update, Natural Resources and Hazards Report.

--, 2005. GIS Data: Williamson Act Subvention Parcels for Humboldt County.

Humboldt County Association of Governments (HCAOG), 2010. Humboldt County Regional Trails Master Plan. Prepared for HCAOG by Planwest Partners in association with the Redwood Community Action Agency and Alta Planning + Design. May.

Humboldt Local Agency Formation Commission (HLAFCo), 2008. Municipal Service Review for the Fortuna Fire Protection District. Prepared for HLAFCo by Planwest Partners. March.

--, 2008. Municipal Service Review for the City of Rio Dell. Prepared for HLAFCo by Planwest Partners. January.

National Register Information System (NRIS), 2008. <http://www.nr.nps.gov/nrloc1.htm>.

North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD), 1995. Particulate Matter (PM₁₀) Attainment Plan Draft Report. May 11.

Planwest Partners, 2008a. IS/MND for the Sawmill and Blue Slide Rd. Annexations and the Bellevue Neighborhood, East Side Industrial, Enes, Timmerman, Waters/Dunn and Withrow GPAs. SCH#2007062006. Prepared for the City of Rio Dell. February.

--, 2008b. Municipal Service Review for the City of Rio Dell. Prepared for the Humboldt Local Agency Formation Commission.

--, 2010. DPEIR for the City of Fortuna General Plan 2030. SCH #2007062106. Prepared by Planwest Partners for the City of Fortuna. July.

Rio Dell, City of, 1975. Rio Dell General Plan.

--, 2001. Noise Element.

--, 2003. City of Rio Dell Hearing Draft Housing Element, Part II.

--, 2004. City of Rio Dell Housing Element.

Rosco et al., 2007. A Cultural Resources Investigation of the Proposed Rio Dell Wastewater Reuse Project. Prepared by Rosco and Associates for the City of Rio Dell.

SHN Consulting Engineers & Geologists, Inc. (SHN), 2007. Environmental Study for the Town of Scotia. Prepared for Pacific Lumber Company. September.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), 1965. Natural Resource Conservation Service. Soils of Western Humboldt County, re-manuscripted on USGS 7.5 minute quads by Humboldt County.

United States Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS), 1992. National Wetland Inventory.

Varner, Mary, 2008. Superintendent, Rio Dell Elementary School District. Pers. Comm. March 31.

Winzler & Kelly, 2007. DEIR for the Rio Dell Wastewater Reuse Project. Prepared for the City of Rio Dell. SCH #2007062006. September.

--, 2010. Draft Environmental Site Assessment Report (ESA) for the Former Eel River Saw Mill (FERSM). Prepared by Winzler & Kelly for the City of Rio Dell. August 27.

APPENDIX A

URBEMIS AIR QUALITY MODELING OUTPUT

Combined Annual Emissions Reports (Tons/Year)

File Name: P:\Rio Dell Project\Application Review 2010\Sawmill GPA-ZA\Initial Study\Sawmill GPA-ZA-GPTA URBEMIS Results.urb924

Project Name: Sawmill GPA-ZA-GPTA

Project Location: California State-wide

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

Summary Report:

CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10.Dust	PM10.Exhaust	PM10	PM2.5.Dust	PM2.5.Exhaust	PM2.5	CO2
2013 TOTALS (tons/year unmitigated)	3.29	2.10	1.96	0.00	1.44	0.12	1.57	0.30	0.11	0.42	381.16

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5	CO2
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	0.42	0.64	1.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	755.50

OPERATIONAL (VEHICLE) EMISSION ESTIMATES

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5	CO2
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	5.59	10.05	72.71	0.06	10.76	2.08	5,913.30

SUM OF AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5	CO2
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	6.01	10.69	74.07	0.06	10.76	2.08	6,668.80

APPENDIX B

CARB GHG EMISSION REDUCTION MEASURES

**CARB GHG Emission Reduction Measures
(AB 32 GHG Measures to be Initiated by CARB)**

ID#	Sector	Strategy Name	ID#	Sector	Strategy Name
1	Fuels	Above ground storage tanks	23	Commercial	SF ₆ reductions from the non-electric sector
2	Transportation	Diesel – off road equipment	24	Transportation	Tire inflation program
3	Forestry	Forestry protocol endorsement	25	Transportation	Cool automobile paints
4	Transportation	Diesel – port trucks	26	Cement	Blended cements
5	Transportation	Diesel – vessel main engine fuel specifications	27	Cement	Energy efficiency of CA cement facilities
6	Transportation	Diesel – commercial harbor craft	28	Transportation	Ban on HFC release from motor vehicle AC service/dismantling
7	Transportation	Green ports	29	Transportation	Diesel – off road equipment
8	Agriculture	Manure management (methane digester)	30	Transportation	Add AC leak tightness test and repair to smog checks
9	Education	Local gov. GHG reduction guidance/protocols	31	Agriculture	Research on GHG reductions from nitrogen land applications
10	Education	Business GHG reduction guidance/protocols	32	Commercial	Specifications for commercial refrigeration
11	Energy Efficiency	Cool communities program	33	Oil and Gas	Reduction in venting/leaks from oil and gas systems
12	Commercial	Reduce high global warming potential (GWP) GHGs in products	34	Transportation	Requirement of low-GWP GHGs for new motor vehicle ACs
13	Commercial	Reduction of PFCs from semiconductor industry	35	Transportation	Hybridization of medium/heavy-duty diesel vehicles
14	Transportation	SmartWay truck efficiency	36	Electricity	Reductions in SF ₆ in electricity generation
15	Transportation	Low carbon fuel standard (LCFS)	37	Commercial	High GWP refrigerant tracking/reporting/recovery
16	Transportation	Reduction of HFC-134a from DIY motor vehicle AC servicing	38	Commercial	Foam recovery/destruction program
17	Waste	Improved landfill gas capture	39	Fire Suppression	Alternative suppressants in fire protection systems
18	Fuels	Gasoline dispenser hose replacement	40	Transportation	Strengthen light-duty vehicle standards
19	Fuels	Portable outboard marine tanks	41	Transportation	Truck stop electrification with incentives for truckers
20	Transportation	Standards for off-cycle driving conditions	42	Transportation	Diesel – vessel speed reductions
21	Transportation	Diesel – privately owned on-road trucks	43	Transportation	Transportation refrigeration – electric standby
22	Transportation	Anti-idling enforcement	44	Agriculture	Electrification of stationary agricultural engines

Source: CARB 2007b; COE 2008.

APPENDIX C

FHWA NOISE MODELING OUTPUT

Existing Northwestern Ave Traffic Noise
 * * * * CASE INFORMATION * * * *

* * * * Results calculated with TNM Version 2.5 * * * *

Existing Northwestern Ave. Traffic Noise

* * * * TRAFFIC VOLUME/SPEED INFORMATION * * * *

Automobile volume (v/h):	5.0
Average automobile speed (mph):	25.0
Medium truck volume (v/h):	0.0
Average medium truck speed (mph):	0.0
Heavy truck volume (v/h):	0.0
Average heavy truck speed (mph):	0.0
Bus volume (v/h):	0.0
Average bus speed (mph):	0.0
Motorcycle volume (v/h):	0.0
Average Motorcycle speed (mph):	0.0

* * * * TERRAIN SURFACE INFORMATION * * * *

Terrain surface: hard

* * * * RECEIVER INFORMATION * * * *

DESCRIPTION OF RECEIVER # 1

Residences on Northwestern Ave.

Distance from center of 12-ft wide, single lane roadway (ft):	33.0
A-weighted Hourly Equivalent Sound Level without Barrier (dBA):	38.3

Existing + Amendment Northwestern Ave Traffic Noise
***** CASE INFORMATION *****

***** Results calculated with TNM Version 2.5 *****

Existing + Amendment Northwestern Ave. Traffic Noise

***** TRAFFIC VOLUME/SPEED INFORMATION *****

Automobile volume (v/h):	11.0
Average automobile speed (mph):	25.0
Medium truck volume (v/h):	0.0
Average medium truck speed (mph):	0.0
Heavy truck volume (v/h):	0.0
Average heavy truck speed (mph):	0.0
BUS volume (v/h):	0.0
Average bus speed (mph):	0.0
Motorcycle volume (v/h):	0.0
Average Motorcycle speed (mph):	0.0

***** TERRAIN SURFACE INFORMATION *****

Terrain surface: soft

***** RECEIVER INFORMATION *****

DESCRIPTION OF RECEIVER # 1

Residences on Northwestern Ave.

Distance from center of 12-ft wide, single lane roadway (ft):	33.0
A-weighted Hourly Equivalent Sound Level without Barrier (dBA):	41.5

Existing HWY 101 Traffic Noise
***** CASE INFORMATION *****

***** Results calculated with TNM Version 2.5 *****

Existing HWY 101 Traffic Noise

***** TRAFFIC VOLUME/SPEED INFORMATION *****

Automobile volume (v/h):	422.0
Average automobile speed (mph):	65.0
Medium truck volume (v/h):	23.0
Average medium truck speed (mph):	65.0
Heavy truck volume (v/h):	23.0
Average heavy truck speed (mph):	65.0
Bus volume (v/h):	0.0
Average bus speed (mph):	0.0
Motorcycle volume (v/h):	0.0
Average Motorcycle speed (mph):	0.0

***** TERRAIN SURFACE INFORMATION *****

Terrain surface: hard

***** RECEIVER INFORMATION *****

DESCRIPTION OF RECEIVER # 1

Industrial/commercial

Distance from center of 12-ft wide, single lane roadway (ft):	120.0
A-weighted Hourly Equivalent Sound Level without Barrier (dBA):	66.9

Existing + Amendment HWY 101 Traffic Noise
* * * * CASE INFORMATION * * * *

* * * * Results calculated with TNM Version 2.5 * * * *

Existing + Project HWY 101 Traffic Noise

* * * * TRAFFIC VOLUME/SPEED INFORMATION * * * *

Automobile volume (v/h):	685.0
Average automobile speed (mph):	65.0
Medium truck volume (v/h):	38.0
Average medium truck speed (mph):	65.0
Heavy truck volume (v/h):	38.0
Average heavy truck speed (mph):	65.0
Bus volume (v/h):	0.0
Average bus speed (mph):	0.0
Motorcycle volume (v/h):	0.0
Average Motorcycle speed (mph):	0.0

* * * * TERRAIN SURFACE INFORMATION * * * *

Terrain surface: hard

* * * * RECEIVER INFORMATION * * * *

DESCRIPTION OF RECEIVER # 1

Industrial/commercial

Distance from center of 12-ft wide, single lane roadway (ft):	120.0
A-weighted Hourly Equivalent Sound Level without Barrier (dBA):	69.0

*** Existing Wildwood Ave Traffic Noise
CASE INFORMATION ***

*** Results calculated with TNM Version 2.5 ***

Existing Wildwood Ave. Traffic Noise

*** TRAFFIC VOLUME/SPEED INFORMATION ***

Automobile volume (v/h):	394.0
Average automobile speed (mph):	35.0
Medium truck volume (v/h):	22.0
Average medium truck speed (mph):	35.0
Heavy truck volume (v/h):	22.0
Average heavy truck speed (mph):	35.0
Bus volume (v/h):	0.0
Average bus speed (mph):	0.0
Motorcycle volume (v/h):	0.0
Average Motorcycle speed (mph):	0.0

*** TERRAIN SURFACE INFORMATION ***

Terrain surface: soft

*** RECEIVER INFORMATION ***

DESCRIPTION OF RECEIVER # 1

Residences on Wildwood Ave.

Distance from center of 12-ft wide, single lane roadway (ft):	33.0
A-weighted Hourly Equivalent Sound Level without Barrier (dBA):	64.8

Existing + Amendment Wildwood Ave Traffic Noise
* * * * CASE INFORMATION * * * *

* * * * Results calculated with TNM Version 2.5 * * * *

Existing + Amendment Wildwood Ave. Traffic Noise

* * * * TRAFFIC VOLUME/SPEED INFORMATION * * * *

Automobile volume (v/h):	606.0
Average automobile speed (mph):	35.0
Medium truck volume (v/h):	33.0
Average medium truck speed (mph):	35.0
Heavy truck volume (v/h):	33.0
Average heavy truck speed (mph):	35.0
Bus volume (v/h):	0.0
Average bus speed (mph):	0.0
Motorcycle volume (v/h):	0.0
Average Motorcycle speed (mph):	0.0

* * * * TERRAIN SURFACE INFORMATION * * * *

Terrain surface: soft

* * * * RECEIVER INFORMATION * * * *

DESCRIPTION OF RECEIVER # 1

Residences on Wildwood Ave.

Distance from center of 12-ft wide, single lane roadway (ft):	33.0
A-weighted Hourly Equivalent Sound Level without Barrier (dBA):	66.6

***** Existing WB HWY 101 Traffic Noise
CASE INFORMATION *****

***** Results calculated with TNM Version 2.5 *****

Existing WB HWY 101 Traffic Noise

***** TRAFFIC VOLUME/SPEED INFORMATION *****

Automobile volume (v/h):	421.0
Average automobile speed (mph):	65.0
Medium truck volume (v/h):	23.0
Average medium truck speed (mph):	65.0
Heavy truck volume (v/h):	23.0
Average heavy truck speed (mph):	65.0
Bus volume (v/h):	0.0
Average bus speed (mph):	0.0
Motorcycle volume (v/h):	0.0
Average Motorcycle speed (mph):	0.0

***** TERRAIN SURFACE INFORMATION *****

Terrain surface: soft

***** RECEIVER INFORMATION *****

DESCRIPTION OF RECEIVER # 1

Residences on Eola Ave.

Distance from center of 12-ft wide, single lane roadway (ft):	60.0
A-weighted Hourly Equivalent Sound Level without Barrier (dBA):	68.1

Existing + Amendment WB HWY 101 Traffic Noise
* * * * CASE INFORMATION * * * *

* * * * Results calculated with TNM Version 2.5 * * * *

Existing + Amendment Eeola Ave. Traffic Noise

* * * * TRAFFIC VOLUME/SPEED INFORMATION * * * *

Automobile volume (v/h):	679.0
Average automobile speed (mph):	65.0
Medium truck volume (v/h):	38.0
Average medium truck speed (mph):	65.0
Heavy truck volume (v/h):	38.0
Average heavy truck speed (mph):	65.0
Bus volume (v/h):	0.0
Average bus speed (mph):	0.0
Motorcycle volume (v/h):	0.0
Average Motorcycle speed (mph):	0.0

* * * * TERRAIN SURFACE INFORMATION * * * *

Terrain surface: soft

* * * * RECEIVER INFORMATION * * * *

DESCRIPTION OF RECEIVER # 1

Residences on Eeola Ave.

Distance from center of 12-ft wide, single lane roadway (ft):	60.0
A-weighted Hourly Equivalent Sound Level without Barrier (dBA):	70.2

***** Existing EB HWY 101 Traffic Noise
CASE INFORMATION *****

***** Results calculated with TNM Version 2.5 *****

Existing EB HWY 101 Traffic Noise

***** TRAFFIC VOLUME/SPEED INFORMATION *****

Automobile volume (v/h):	500.0
Average automobile speed (mph):	65.0
Medium truck volume (v/h):	29.0
Average medium truck speed (mph):	65.0
Heavy truck volume (v/h):	29.0
Average heavy truck speed (mph):	65.0
Bus volume (v/h):	0.0
Average bus speed (mph):	0.0
Motorcycle volume (v/h):	0.0
Average Motorcycle speed (mph):	0.0

***** TERRAIN SURFACE INFORMATION *****

Terrain surface: soft

***** RECEIVER INFORMATION *****

DESCRIPTION OF RECEIVER # 1

Residences on Bellevue Ave.

Distance from center of 12-ft wide, single lane roadway (ft):	60.0
A-weighted Hourly Equivalent Sound Level without Barrier (dBA):	69.0

Existing + Amendment EB HWY 101 Traffic Noise
* * * * CASE INFORMATION * * * *

* * * * Results calculated with TNM Version 2.5 * * * *

Existing + Amendment EB HWY 101 Traffic Noise

* * * * TRAFFIC VOLUME/SPEED INFORMATION * * * *

Automobile volume (v/h):	764.0
Average automobile speed (mph):	65.0
Medium truck volume (v/h):	43.0
Average medium truck speed (mph):	65.0
Heavy truck volume (v/h):	43.0
Average heavy truck speed (mph):	65.0
Bus volume (v/h):	0.0
Average bus speed (mph):	0.0
Motorcycle volume (v/h):	0.0
Average Motorcycle speed (mph):	0.0

* * * * TERRAIN SURFACE INFORMATION * * * *

Terrain surface: soft

* * * * RECEIVER INFORMATION * * * *

DESCRIPTION OF RECEIVER # 1

Residences on Belleview Ave.


Distance from center of 12-ft wide, single lane roadway (ft):	60.0
A-weighted Hourly Equivalent Sound Level without Barrier (dBA):	70.8


675 Wildwood Avenue
Rio Dell, CA 95562
(707) 764-3532



For Meeting of: May 30, 2012

To: Planning Commission

From: Kevin Caldwell, Community Development Director 

Through: Ron Henrickson, City Manager 

Date: May 22, 2012

Subject: Design Review Regulations

Recommendation:

That the Planning Commission:

1. Receive staff's report regarding amending the City's existing sign regulations to address Election/Political signs;
2. Open the public hearing, receive public input and deliberate;
3. Adopt Resolution No. PC 053-2012 recommending that the City Council establish Design Review Guidelines, Section 17.25.050 of the Rio Dell Municipal Code (RDMC).

Background and Discussion

The General Plan calls for the establishment of Design Review regulations in an attempt to enhance and preserve the City's scenic qualities, promote quality designs, landscaping and to protect and maintain property values in the City.

The purpose of the design review process is to promote orderly and harmonious growth within the City. The intent of the design review process is to establish discretionary review of development projects that require additional site and design considerations beyond conformance with minimum standards of the Zoning Code.

Instead of recommending strict and rigid development standards which often times limits creativity, staff is recommending **Guiding Principles and Design Concepts**. Below are the recommended Guiding Principles:

Guiding Principles

- To encourage high quality land/site planning, architecture and landscape design;
- To ensure physical, visual, and functional compatibility between uses; and
- To ensure proper attention is paid to site and architectural design, thereby protecting land values.

These proposed regulations will apply to all lands within the City. All parcels will be designated with the Design Review Combining Zone “D”. Except as otherwise exempt pursuant to **Section 17.250.050(3)** Design Review is required for the following:

- Major Subdivisions;
- Multi-family residential developments;
- Commercial development;
- Industrial development; and
- Public/quasi-public developments (e.g. public safety facilities, library, city facilities).

The following structures and improvements are recommended to be exempt from Design Review. However, such structures may require additional permits, such as a ministerial building permit to ensure compliance with adopted Building Code standards and applicable Zoning Code provisions.

- Additions to structures less than 10% of its existing size;
- Repairs and maintenance of site improvements or structures that do not add to, enlarge, or expand the area occupied by the land use, or the floor area of the structure.
- Exterior repairs that employ the same materials and design as the original construction are also exempt from Design Review;
- Interior alterations that do not increase the gross floor area within the structure, or change/expand the permitted use of the structure;
- Construction, alteration, or maintenance by a public utility or public agency of underground or overhead utilities intended to service existing or nearby approved developments (e.g., water, gas, electric or telecommunication supply or disposal systems, including wires, mains, drains, sewers, pipes, conduits, cables, fire-alarm boxes, police call boxes, traffic signals, hydrants, and similar facilities **and** equipment);

Staff is recommending that the approving authority for Design Review be the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission will be empowered to review and approve, conditionally approve, or deny Design Review applications using the guiding principles and design concepts, application review process, and required findings.

At any point in the future, the City Council may, by Resolution, delegate the Approving Authority for Design Review to the City Council, a Design Review Committee, the Community Development Director and/or the City Manager.

The designated Approving Authority will have the authority to apply the "Guiding Principles" flexibly to account for circumstances relating to the site, provided the required findings in **Section 17.250.050(8)** are made and using the following Design Concepts:

Design Concepts

Residential Subdivisions. The following Design Concepts generally apply to major subdivisions (e.g. five or more parcels) of land for residential purposes. Some of the Design Concepts will not apply, to certain projects due to the size of the development. However, these concepts will be applied whenever possible in the design of residential and mixed use projects. The City encourages:

- (1) A balanced mix of land uses, including housing, schooling, and parks/open space, to meet the needs of residents as appropriate based on project scale. Large scale development proposals should also provide for employment, commercial/retail, recreational and entertainment needs of community residents.
- (2) Pedestrian friendly neighborhoods, which are walkable in size with an obvious center. The neighborhood center should be a place of social interaction with a combination of commercial, civic, cultural and recreational uses.
- (3) Housing diversity with a variety of housing types, sizes, and densities.
- (4) Vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian, and transit connectivity throughout the neighborhood and with the surrounding neighborhoods and uses. More specifically, neighborhoods should be designed with an interconnected street system that will blend well into the existing street system, diffuse traffic within the neighborhood, and minimize barriers within and between neighborhoods.
- (5) Where feasible, joint-use of open space facilities such as drainage facilities, detention basins, utility corridors etc. for trails, bikeways and Parks.
- (6) Maintaining significant natural features (e.g., terrain, drainage, vegetation).
- (7) Minimization of urban runoff through the use of retention and detention facilities and the use of open bio-swale drainage channels
- (8) Pedestrian friendly streetscapes that may include orientation of homes to common areas, parks, or other open space areas.
- (9) Where feasible, design streets with separated sidewalks that incorporate a planter strip between the back of curb and sidewalk.

Residential Multi Family. The following Design Concepts apply to the review of residential multi-family development. The City encourages:

- (1) Mass, scale and architecture which is compatible with existing and adjacent neighborhoods. The intent is to encourage appropriate transitions between uses and structures of varying residential density and a general compatibility of architectural styles.
- (2) Original designs that are tailored to the site and discourage monotonous or institutional type buildings and site design.
- (3) Site designs that preserve, enhance and incorporate the significant natural features of a site as an element within the overall design.
- (4) High quality building designs that consist of durable and maintainable materials for the exterior treatment of the buildings that complement the building mass and articulation.
- (5) The establishment of a streetscape presence and appearance through setbacks, landscaping, building placement, and architecture that defines the pedestrian and vehicular corridor and presents an appealing and continuous theme along a sidewalk, street or trail.
- (6) Landscaping that softens the appearance of pavement and structures, and provides an eventual tree canopy along the street and pedestrian walkways.
- (7) Ensure that design provisions do not preclude the development of multi-family housing affordable to all income levels.

Non-Residential Site Planning. The following Design Concepts apply to site planning and design for non-residential (commercial, office, industrial, and public/quasi-public) development. The City encourages:

- (1) Design of new development with particular attention to compatibility between non-residential and adjacent residential uses/properties within the project vicinity.
- (2) A unified design theme for integrated developments. All buildings within an integrated development shall be designed consistent with the approved design theme.
- (3) Pedestrian-friendly design which incorporates pedestrian amenities and outdoor gathering places into the project design with consideration given to the climate and planned use of space.
- (4) A streetscape appearance that defines the pedestrian and vehicle corridor and presents an appealing and continuous theme along a sidewalk or street.
- (5) Office and light industrial parks and integrated employment campuses that provide outdoor areas for eating and sitting, retail and service venues as appropriate and other amenities for project employees.
- (6) Design flexibility for mixed-use development that ensures compatibility of use types and promotes beneficial relationships among uses.
- (7) Where feasible, design streets with separated sidewalks that incorporate a planter strip between the back of curb and sidewalk.

Non-Residential Architecture. The following Design Concepts apply to non-residential (commercial, office, industrial, and public/quasi-public) development. The City encourages:

- (1) High quality building designs that consist of durable and maintainable materials and that provide visual interest and diversity to the community.
- (2) Use of an architectural style and or/theme for new non-residential development that is consistent for building elevations of a single structure or consistent among all buildings within an integrated development.
- (3) Design of buildings or structures that are sensitive to the neighborhood character with regard to scale, architectural style, use of materials and bulk.
- (4) Interesting and attractive architecture which includes varied relief of the facade elements and detailed articulation of the building features.
- (5) Incorporate quality site design, including landscaping, signage and other elements of site design.

Scope of Design Review

The recommended scope of Design Review is identified below by land use type.

- **Neighborhood Design - Major Subdivisions:**
 - Relationship of land uses and density
 - Lot configuration **and** orientation
 - Street design/relationship to existing street network
 - Orientation to open space and significant natural features
 - Bikeways, trails and pedestrian facilities and connectivity with other development
- **Multi-family Developments:**
 - Architecture- style, mass and scale, articulation, materials, and relationship to surrounding use and style
 - Site plan- unit placement, garage location
 - Landscaping and lighting for Multi-Family developments
 - Streetscape design
 - Fences and walls
 - Solar access and shading
- **Non-residential Development** (commercial, office, industrial, and public/quasi-public)
 - Architecture- style or theme, mass and scale, articulation, materials, relationship to surrounding use and style
 - Site plan- building location/orientation to street, parking, grading, relationship to surrounding property
 - Access- vehicular and pedestrian

Pedestrian amenities
Landscaping and lighting
Edge treatment between uses and different zones
Loading and services (trash and recycling)
Mechanical screening
Signs

Design Review Process

Application Submittal. Design Review applications shall be submitted to the Planning Department on a City application form. All plans shall be professionally drawn by qualified individuals, drawn at a reasonable scale to clearly identify the improvements and shall be on 18" x 24" or 24" x 36" and shall conform to the following requirements:

- **Building Plans and Elevations** shall identify the materials, colors, textures, etc.
- **Landscaping Plans** shall include common name, botanical name, size of plants/trees at planting and maturity, location, spacing, lawns, hardscape, walkways, streetscape furniture (i.e. benches, bicycle racks, art, water features, kiosks, bus shelters, etc.), ground cover, weed treatment, finished contours, parking areas, curbs, gutters, sidewalks and the edge of pavement.
- **Irrigation Plans** shall include location of sprinkler heads, and/or drip irrigation, location and size of irrigation pipe, water meters, backflow prevention devices, control valves, etc.
- **Photometric Plans** shall include the type, location, height, style and limits of the predicted maintained lighting levels of the proposed lighting fixtures.
- **Sign Plans** shall include the location, type (e.g. wall mounted, monument, pylon), size, color, font styles and lighting details.

Application Review. Design Review shall generally occur within the framework of other project reviews/approvals associated with a given project. In such cases, the Planning Department shall circulate the project for review and comment by appropriate departments, entities, and agencies prior to public hearing by the designated Approving Authority. Where no other discretionary action is associated with a project that is subject to Design Review, the Planning Director shall, within 15 working days of application submittal, determine whether or not the application is complete.

The applicant shall be notified in writing of the determination of application completeness. Once any required review by related departments, entities, and agencies has been completed, the Planning staff shall prepare a report to the Planning Commission on the project with a recommendation for approval, conditional approval or denial of the Design Review application.

Design Review Determination

Findings for Design Review Approvals. Design Review approvals shall be granted only when the designated Approving Authority makes all of the following findings:

- (1) The proposed project is consistent with the objectives of the General Plan, complies with applicable Zoning regulations, Specific Plan provisions, Special Planning Area provisions, and is consistent with the applicable "Guiding Principles" and "Design Concepts" in **Section 17.250.050(5)** Rio Dell Municipal Code (RDMC).
- (2) The proposed architecture, site design, and landscape are suitable for the purposes of the building and the site and will enhance the character of the neighborhood and community.
- (3) The architecture, including the character, scale and quality of the design, relationship with the site and other buildings, building materials, screening of exterior appurtenances, exterior lighting and signing and similar elements establishes a clear design concept and is compatible with the character of existing or anticipated buildings on adjoining and nearby properties.
- (4) The proposed project will not create conflicts with vehicular, bicycle, or pedestrian transportation modes of circulation.

Additional Findings for Residential Design Review Applications. Design Review applications for single-family residential subdivision maps shall be granted only when the designated Approving Authority makes the additional finding that the residential subdivision is well integrated with the City's street network, creates desirable neighborhood environments, reflects traditional architectural styles, and establishes a pedestrian friendly environment.

Procedures for Zoning Ordinance Amendments

Pursuant to Section 17.30.010 of the City of Rio Dell Municipal Code, the following City procedures are required to amend the Ordinance:

- An amendment may be initiated by one or more owners of property affected by the proposed amendment, as set out in Section 17.30.010(3), or by action of the Planning Commission, or the City Council.
- The application of one or more property owners for the initiation of an amendment shall be filed in the office of the City Clerk on a form provided, accompanied by a filing fee.
- Subject only to the rules regarding the placing of matters on the Planning Commission agenda, the matter shall be set for a public hearing.
- Notice of hearing time and place shall be published once in a newspaper of general circulation at least ten calendar days before the hearing or by posting in at least three public places.

- At the public hearing, the Planning Commission shall hear any person affected by the proposed amendment. The hearing may be continued from time to time.
- Within 40 days of the conclusion of the hearing, the Planning Commission shall submit to the City Council a written report of recommendations and reasons therefore.
- Subject only to the rules regarding the placing of matters on its agenda, the City Council, at its next regular meeting following the receipt of such report, shall cause the matter to be set for a public hearing. Notice of the time and place of the hearing shall be given as provided in Section 17.30.010(5), hereof.
- At the public hearing, the City Council shall hear any person affected by the proposed amendment. The hearing may be continued to a specified future date, but shall be concluded within 60 days of the commencement thereof.
- The City Council shall not make any change in the proposed amendment until the proposed change has been referred to the Planning Commission for a report, and the Planning Commission report has been filed with the City Council.

Zone Reclassification Required Finding:

1. The proposed amendment is consistent and compatible with the General Plan and any implementation programs that may be affected.

Section 65860(a) of the Government Code requires that zoning ordinances and amendments be consistent with the General Plan and any applicable specific plan. The General Plan, Implementation Table, Table 1-3, calls for the development of Design Review Standards. As such the proposed Design Review Ordinance is consistent with the General Plan.

2. The proposed amendments have been processed in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The primary purpose of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is to inform the decision makers and the public of potential environmental effects of a proposed project.

Based on the nature of the project, staff has determined that the project is Statutorily Exempt pursuant to Section 15061(b) (3) of the CEQA Guidelines, Title 14, Chapter 3 of the California Code of Regulations. Pursuant to Section 15061(b) (3) of the CEQA Guidelines this exemption is covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a **significant** effect on the environment. Where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the project in question may have a significant effect on the environment, the project is not subject to CEQA. Based on the nature of the proposed amendment, staff believes there is no evidence to suggest that the amendment will have a significant effect on the environment.

Financial Impact

The City is responsible for the costs associated with the proposed amendment. The cost is insignificant and will not result in additional budget expenditures or revisions.

Alternatives

The Planning Commission may choose not to recommend approval of the proposed Design Review Ordinance. Staff does not recommend this alternative.

Attachments:

1. Resolution No. PC 053-2012 recommending that the City Council approve and adopt the recommended Design Review Ordinance, Section 17.25.050 of the Rio Dell Municipal Code
2. Draft Ordinance No. 291-2012 establishing a Design Review Ordinance, Section 17.25.050 of the Rio Dell Municipal Code.
3. Design Review Handout

RESOLUTION NO. PC 053-2012

**RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF RIO DELL
RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF THE DESIGN REVIEW ORDINANCE:**

WHEREAS the General Plan contains policies that encourage architectural guidelines; and

WHEREAS the General Plan contains implementation measures that call for the development of Design Review standards and guidelines; and

WHEREAS the purpose of the Design Review process is to promote orderly and harmonious growth within the City; and

WHEREAS the Design Review process is intended to preserve and improve the scenic amenities of the City and to protect the City's natural environment, its scenic vistas and the community's overall aesthetic quality; and

WHEREAS the Design Review process encourages good quality design, including the use of harmonious materials and colors, and the appropriate use of landscaping; and

WHEREAS in addition to protecting the City's scenic and natural resources, the Design Review process is intended to protect and maintain property values; and

WHEREAS the intent of the Design Review process is to establish discretionary review of development projects that require additional site and design considerations beyond conformance with minimum standards of the Zoning Code; and

WHEREAS the City has reviewed and processed the proposed Design Review Ordinance in conformance with Sections 65350 – 65362 of the California Government Code; and

WHEREAS the City has reviewed and processed the proposed Design Review Ordinance in conformance with Section 17.30.010 of the City of Rio Dell Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS the City finds that based on evidence on file and presented in the staff report that the proposed Design Review Ordinance is deemed to be in the public interest; and

WHEREAS the City finds that based on evidence on file and presented in the staff report that the proposed Design Review Ordinance is consistent and compatible with a comprehensive view of the General Plan and any implementation programs that may be affected; and

WHEREAS the City finds that based on evidence on file and presented in the staff report that the potential impacts of the proposed Design Review Ordinance has been assessed and have been determined not to be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare; and

WHEREAS the proposed Design Review Ordinance has been processed in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Government Code and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and

WHEREAS the City has determined that the establishment of a Design Review Ordinance is Statutorily Exempt pursuant to Section 15061(b) (3) of the CEQA Guidelines, Title 14, Chapter 3 of the California Code of Regulations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Commission of the City of Rio Dell recommends that the City Council approve the proposed Design Review Ordinance.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Rio Dell at their meeting of May 30, 2012 by the following vote:

AYES:	Commissioners:
NOES:	Commissioners:
ABSENT:	Commissioners:
ABSTAIN:	Commissioners:

Dave Gonzales, Chair

ATTEST:

Karen Dunham, City Clerk

ORDINANCE NO. 291 - 2012

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RIO DELL
ESTABLISHING DESIGN REVIEW REGULATIONS,
SECTION 17.25.050 OF THE RIO DELL MUNICIPAL CODE:**

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RIO DELL DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

WHEREAS the General Plan contains policies that encourage architectural guidelines; and

WHEREAS the General Plan contains implementation measures that call for the development of Design Review standards and guidelines; and

WHEREAS the purpose of the Design Review process is to promote orderly and harmonious growth within the City; and

WHEREAS the Design Review process is intended to preserve and improve the scenic amenities of the City and to protect the City's natural environment, its scenic vistas and the community's overall aesthetic quality; and

WHEREAS the Design Review process encourages good quality design, including the use of harmonious materials and colors, and the appropriate use of landscaping; and

WHEREAS in addition to protecting the City's scenic and natural resources, the Design Review process is intended to protect and maintain property values; and

WHEREAS the intent of the Design Review process is to establish discretionary review of development projects that require additional site and design considerations beyond conformance with minimum standards of the Zoning Code; and

WHEREAS the City has reviewed and processed the proposed Design Review Ordinance in conformance with Sections 65350 – 65362 of the California Government Code; and

WHEREAS the City has reviewed and processed the proposed Design Review Ordinance in conformance with Section 17.30.010 of the City of Rio Dell Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS the City finds that based on evidence on file and presented in the staff report that the proposed Design Review Ordinance is deemed to be in the public interest; and

WHEREAS the City finds that based on evidence on file and presented in the staff report that the proposed Design Review Ordinance is consistent and compatible with a comprehensive view of the General Plan and any implementation programs that may be affected; and

WHEREAS the City finds that based on evidence on file and presented in the staff report that the potential impacts of the proposed Design Review Ordinance has been assessed and have been determined not to be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare; and

WHEREAS the proposed Design Review Ordinance has been processed in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Government Code and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and

WHEREAS the City has determined that the establishment of a Design Review Ordinance is Statutorily Exempt pursuant to Section 15061(b) (3) of the CEQA Guidelines, Title 14, Chapter 3 of the California Code of Regulations.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of Rio Dell does hereby ordain as follows:

Section 1.

1. Purpose and Intent

The purpose of the design review process is to promote orderly and harmonious growth within the City. The intent of the design review process is to establish discretionary review of development projects that require additional site and design considerations beyond conformance with minimum standards of the Zoning Code. This Chapter also includes "Guiding Principles" and "Design Concepts" to be used by the designated Approving Authority in reviewing proposed projects for design consistency the City's standards.

2. Design Review Applicability

These regulations shall apply to lands designated with the Design Review Combining Zone "D" on the Zoning Maps. In addition, except as otherwise exempt pursuant to **Section 17.250.050(3)** Design Review is required for the following:

- (a) Major Subdivisions;
- (b) Multi-family residential developments;
- (c) Commercial development;
- (d) Industrial development; and
- (e) Public/quasi-public developments (e.g. public safety facilities, library, City facilities).

3. Design Review Exemptions

The following structures and improvements are exempt from Design Review. However, such structures may require additional permits, such as a ministerial building permit to ensure compliance with adopted Building Code standards and applicable Zoning Code provisions.

- (a) Additions to structures less than 10% of its existing size;
- (b) Repairs and maintenance of site improvements or structures that do not add to, enlarge, or expand the area occupied by the land use, or the floor area of the structure. Exterior repairs that employ the same materials and design as the original construction are also exempt from Design Review;
- (c) Interior alterations that do not increase the gross floor area within the structure, or change/expand the permitted use of the structure;

- (d) Construction, alteration, or maintenance by a public utility or public agency of underground or overhead utilities intended to service existing or nearby approved developments (e.g., water, gas, electric or telecommunication supply or disposal systems, including wires, mains, drains, sewers, pipes, conduits, cables, fire-alarm boxes, police call boxes, traffic signals, hydrants, and similar facilities **and** equipment);

4. Approving Authority

The Approving Authority for Design Review shall be the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission shall review and approve, conditionally approve, or deny Design Review applications using the guiding principles and design concepts, application review process, and findings identified herein. At any point in the future, the City Council may delegate the Approving Authority for Design Review to the City Council, a Design Review Committee, the Community Development Director and/or the City Manager. Subsequent delegation of Approving Authority shall be adopted by Resolution, identifying the City's designated Approving Authority, along with any special regulations for review and action on Design Review applications.

Design Review approval is required prior to issuance of any ministerial building permits or site improvement plans and prior to or in conjunction with discretionary action of corresponding development applications (e.g., Maps, Conditional Use Permit, Variance), except as otherwise exempted pursuant to **Section 17.250.050(3)** of this Chapter.

5. Guiding Principles and Design Concepts

This Chapter provides a set of "Guiding Principles" and "Design Concepts" setting forth various aesthetic and functional provisions to guide residential, commercial, office, industrial and public/quasi public development in the City. The "Guiding Principles" are listed below. Over time, the City may, by ordinance amending this section, refine or expand these principles and concepts to reflect the changing desires of the community.

- To encourage high quality land/site planning, architecture and landscape design;
- To ensure physical, visual, and functional compatibility between uses: and
- To ensure proper attention is paid to site and architectural design, thereby protecting land values.

The designated Approving Authority under this Chapter shall have the authority to apply the "Guiding Principles" flexibly to account for circumstances relating to the site, provided the required findings in **Section 17.250.050(8)** are made and using the following Design Concepts:

(a) Residential Subdivisions. The following Design Concepts generally apply to major subdivisions (e.g. five or more parcels) of land for residential purposes. Some of the Design Concepts will not apply, to certain projects due to the size of the development. However, these concepts will be applied whenever possible in the design of residential and mixed use projects. The City encourages:

- (1) A balanced mix of land uses, including housing, schooling, and parks/open space, to meet the needs of residents as appropriate based on project scale. Large scale development proposals should also provide for employment, commercial/retail, recreational and

entertainment needs of community residents.

(2) Pedestrian friendly neighborhoods, which are walkable in size with an obvious center. The neighborhood center should be a place of social interaction with a combination of commercial, civic, cultural and recreational uses.

(3) Housing diversity with a variety of housing types, sizes, and densities.

(4) Vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian, and transit connectivity throughout the neighborhood and with the surrounding neighborhoods and uses. More specifically, neighborhoods should be designed with an interconnected street system that will blend well into the existing street system, diffuse traffic within the neighborhood, and minimize barriers within and between neighborhoods.

(5) Where feasible, joint-use of open space facilities such as drainage facilities, detention basins, utility corridors etc. for trails, bikeways and Parks.

(6) Maintaining significant natural features (e.g., terrain, drainage, vegetation).

(7) Minimization of urban runoff through the use of retention and detention facilities and the use of open bio-swale drainage channels

(8) Pedestrian friendly streetscapes that may include orientation of homes to common areas, parks, or other open space areas.

(9) Where feasible, design streets with separated sidewalks that incorporate a planter strip between the back of curb and sidewalk.

(b) Residential Multi Family. The following Design Concepts apply to the review of residential multi-family development. The City encourages:

(1) Mass, scale and architecture which is compatible with existing and adjacent neighborhoods. The intent is to encourage appropriate transitions between uses and structures of varying residential density and a general compatibility of architectural styles.

(2) Original designs that are tailored to the site and discourage monotonous or institutional type buildings and site design.

(3) Site designs that preserve, enhance and incorporate the significant natural features of a site as an element within the overall design.

(4) High quality building designs that consist of durable and maintainable materials for the exterior treatment of the buildings that complement the building mass and articulation.

(5) The establishment of a streetscape presence and appearance through setbacks, landscaping, building placement, and architecture that defines the pedestrian and vehicular corridor and presents an appealing and continuous theme along a sidewalk, street or trail.

(6) Landscaping that softens the appearance of pavement and structures, and provides an eventual tree canopy along the street and pedestrian walkways.

(7) Ensure that design provisions do not preclude the development of multi-family housing affordable to all income levels.

(c) Non-Residential Site Planning. The following Design Concepts apply to site planning and design for non-residential (commercial, office, industrial, and public/quasi-public) development. The City encourages:

(1) Design of new development with particular attention to compatibility between non-residential and adjacent residential uses/properties within the project vicinity.

(2) A unified design theme for integrated developments. All buildings within an integrated development shall be designed consistent with the approved design theme.

(3) Pedestrian-friendly design which incorporates pedestrian amenities and outdoor gathering places into the project design with consideration given to the climate and planned use of space.

(4) A streetscape appearance that defines the pedestrian and vehicle corridor and presents an appealing and continuous theme along a sidewalk or street.

(5) Office and light industrial parks and integrated employment campuses that provide outdoor areas for eating and sitting, retail and service venues as appropriate, and other amenities for project employees.

(6) Design flexibility for mixed-use development that ensures compatibility of use types and promotes beneficial relationships among uses.

(7) Where feasible, design streets with separated sidewalks that incorporate a planter strip between the back of curb and sidewalk.

(d) Non-Residential Architecture. The following Design Concepts apply to non-residential (commercial, office, industrial, and public/quasi-public) development. The City encourages:

(1) High quality building designs that consist of durable and maintainable materials and that provide visual interest and diversity to the community.

(2) Use of an architectural style and or/theme for new non-residential development that is consistent for building elevations of a single structure or consistent among all buildings within an integrated development.

(3) Design of buildings or structures that are sensitive to the neighborhood character with regard to scale, architectural style, use of materials and bulk.

(4) Interesting and attractive architecture which includes varied relief of the facade elements and detailed articulation of the building features.

(5) Incorporate quality site design, including landscaping, signage and other elements of site design.

6. Scope of Design Review

To implement the principles and concepts in **Section 17.250.050(5)** the scope of Design Review is listed below by land use type. Applications for Design Review shall include adequate information to evaluate the project. Specific application submittal requirements shall be listed on the application form distributed by the Planning Department.

(a) Neighborhood Design - Major Subdivisions:

Relationship of land uses and density
Lot configuration **and** orientation
Street design/relationship to existing street network
Orientation to open space and significant natural features
Bikeways, trails and pedestrian facilities and connectivity with other development

(b) Multi-family Developments:

Architecture- style, mass and scale, articulation, materials, and relationship to surrounding use and style
Site plan- unit placement, garage location
Landscaping and lighting for Multi-Family developments
Streetscape design
Fences and walls
Solar access and shading

(c) Non-residential Development (commercial, office, industrial, and public/quasi-public)

Architecture- style or theme, mass and scale, articulation, materials, relationship to surrounding use and style
Site plan- building location/orientation to street, parking, grading, relationship to surrounding property
Access- vehicular and pedestrian
Pedestrian amenities
Landscaping and lighting
Edge treatment between uses and different zones
Loading and services (trash and recycling)
Mechanical screening
Signs

7. Design Review Process

(a) Application Submittal. Design Review applications shall be submitted to the Planning Department on a City application form. All plans shall be professionally drawn by qualified individuals, drawn at a reasonable scale to clearly identify the improvements and shall be on 18" x 24" or 24" x 36" and shall conform to the following requirements:

- **Building Plans and Elevations** shall identify the materials, colors, textures, etc.
- **Landscaping Plans** shall include common name, botanical name, size of plants/trees at planting and maturity, location, spacing, lawns, hardscape, walkways, streetscape furniture (i.e. benches, bicycle racks, art, water features, kiosks, bus shelters, etc.), ground cover, weed treatment, finished contours, parking areas, curbs, gutters, sidewalks and the edge of pavement.

- **Irrigation Plans** shall include location of sprinkler heads, and/or drip irrigation, location and size of irrigation pipe, water meters, backflow prevention devices, control valves, etc.
- **Photometric Plans** shall include the type, location, height, style and limits of the predicted maintained lighting levels of the proposed lighting fixtures.
- **Sign Plans** shall include the location, type (e.g. wall mounted, monument, pylon), size, color, font styles and lighting details.

(b) Application Review. Design Review shall generally occur within the framework of other project reviews/approvals associated with a given project. In such cases, the Planning Department shall circulate the project for review and comment by appropriate departments, entities, and agencies prior to public hearing by the designated Approving Authority. Where no other discretionary action is associated with a project that is subject to Design Review, the Planning Director shall, within 15 working days of application submittal, determine whether or not the application is complete. The applicant is encouraged to contact staff prior to submitting the application for a preliminary review of the project. The applicant shall be notified in writing of the determination of application completeness. Once any required review by related departments, entities, and agencies has been completed, the Planning staff shall prepare a report to the designated Approving Authority on the project with a recommendation for approval, conditional approval or denial of the Design Review application. Planning staff shall be responsible for assimilating the comments and recommendations of related departments and agencies into project modifications or Conditions of Approval, as well as to ensure conformance with applicable provisions of the Municipal Code, and any subsequently adopted standards, guidelines, or area plans.

(c) Environmental Review. The project shall be reviewed in accordance with the environmental review procedures of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Design Review shall generally not result in the need for CEQA evaluation for a project that is otherwise exempt.

(d) Notice and Hearing/Determination. Public notice and hearings for Design Review applications under consideration by the designated Approving Authority shall be conducted in accordance with Chapter 17.35 of the Rio Dell Municipal Code (RDMC). The notice shall identify the subject parcel, describe the request, and identify the date of the meeting. The notice shall also identify the opportunity to provide input prior to the determination and the right to appeal the determination in accordance with this Chapter.

(e) Appeals. Appeals shall be conducted in accordance with **Section 17.35.050** of the Rio Dell Municipal Code (RDMC).

8. Design Review Determination

(a) Findings for Design Review Approvals. Design Review approvals shall be granted only when the designated Approving Authority makes all of the following findings:

(1) The proposed project is consistent with the objectives of the General Plan, complies with applicable Zoning regulations, Specific Plan provisions, Special Planning Area provisions, and is consistent with the applicable "Guiding Principles" and "Design Concepts" in **Section 17.250.050(5)** Rio Dell Municipal Code (RDMC).

(2) The proposed architecture, site design, and landscape are suitable for the purposes of the building and the site and will enhance the character of the neighborhood and community.

(3) The architecture, including the character, scale and quality of the design, relationship with the site and other buildings, building materials, screening of exterior appurtenances, exterior lighting and signing and similar elements establishes a clear design concept and is compatible with the character of existing or anticipated buildings on adjoining and nearby properties.

(4) The proposed project will not create conflicts with vehicular, bicycle, or pedestrian transportation modes of circulation.

(b) Additional Findings for Residential Design Review Applications. Design Review applications for single-family residential subdivision maps shall be granted only when the designated Approving Authority makes the additional finding that the residential subdivision is well integrated with the City's street network, creates desirable neighborhood environments, reflects traditional architectural styles, and establishes a pedestrian friendly environment.

(c) Conditions. The designated Approving Authority may require modifications to plans in whole or in part and may condition the Design Review application to ensure specific design features, construction materials, and conformance with all applicable provisions of this chapter.

(d) Permit Issuance. Approval of the Design Review application shall only become valid upon completion of the designated ten-day appeal period.

(e) Permit Term. Where Design Review is approved in conjunction with a related action, the Design Review approval shall remain valid for a period consistent with related review/approval. Where no other discretionary review/approval is required, the Design Review approval shall be valid for a period of three (3) years from the date of final approval.

Section 2. Severability

If any provision of the ordinance is invalidated by any court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining provisions shall not be affected and shall continue in full force and effect.

Section 3. Limitation of Actions

Any action to challenge the validity or legality of any provision of this ordinance on any grounds shall be brought by court action commenced within ninety (90) days of the date of adoption of this ordinance.

Section 4. CEQA Compliance

The City Council has determined that the adoption of this ordinance is exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), subject to Section 15061 of the CEQA Guidelines. Due to the nature of the proposed code revisions, there is no evidence that any impact to the environment would occur as a result of adoption of the Ordinance. Any environmental affects associated with adoption and implementation of the Ordinance would be beneficial in nature.

Section 5. Effective Date

This ordinance becomes effective thirty (30) days after the date of its approval and adoption.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the forgoing Ordinance was duly introduced at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Rio Dell on June 19, 2012 and furthermore the forgoing Ordinance was passed, approved and adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Rio Dell, held on the 3rd of July 2012 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Julie Woodall, Mayor

ATTEST:

Karen Dunham, City Clerk

Design Review

Design Review is required for all major (five or more parcels) residential subdivisions, multi-family, commercial, industrial and public and quasi public developments. Design review is a discretionary process established to ensure quality development in accordance with the City's Design Guidelines and to ensure that the appearance of development will be compatible and harmonious with the use and enjoyment of surrounding properties. Design Review approval is required prior to issuance of any ministerial building permits or site improvement plans and prior to or in conjunction with discretionary action of corresponding development applications (e.g., Conditional Use Permit, Variance).

Guiding Principles

- To encourage high quality land/site planning, architecture and landscape design;
- To ensure physical, visual, and functional compatibility between uses: and
- To ensure proper attention is paid to site and architectural design, thereby protecting land values.

Pre-Application Meeting

Prior to submitting a formal application, the City encourages the applicant to schedule a Preliminary Review meeting (\$75.00) with the Planning Department to review and discuss the project.

Submittal Requirements

- Completed Application
- Owners labels within 300 feet of the project site with notarized Letter of Certification
- Completed Environmental Questionnaire
- Building Plans (10 copies) and Elevations (10 color copies and CD pdf or jpeg copy)
- Landscaping Plans (10 color copies and CD pdf or jpeg copy)
- Irrigation Plans (2 copies)
- Photometric Plans (2 copies)
- Sign Plans (2 copies)
- Preliminary Title Report current within 6 months of application
- Deposit: \$500.00 made payable to the City of Rio Dell

Please note that the application can only be deemed complete upon submittal of **ALL** the above materials. Please refer to Ordinance 291-2012 for additional information, or contact the Planning Department at (707) 764-3532.